

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action mailed January 26, 2006, has been received and reviewed. Claims 1 through 59 are currently pending in the application. Claims 12, 15 through 23, 38 through 42, 49, and 58 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1 through 11, 13, 14, 24 through 37, 43 through 48, 50 through 57, and 59 stand rejected. Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 9 through 11, 13, 14, 27, 28, 31, 35 through 37, 45, 46, 48, and 53 through 55, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the application as amended herein.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

Applicant wishes to draw the Examiner's attention to the Information Disclosure Statement filed with the Office on July 13, 2005, and notes that only Foreign Patent Documents DE 82 03 991, FR 2 788 498, GB 382,813, and the International Search Report dated June 1, 2005, were initialed by the Examiner and not U.S. Patent No. 4,942,970. It is respectfully requested that U.S. Patent No. 4,942,970 referenced therein be made of record in the present application and that an initialed copy of Form PTO/SB/08 be returned to the undersigned attorney evidencing the same.

**35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Anticipation Rejections**

Anticipation Rejection Based on Great Britain Patent No. GB 382,813 to International Paper Company

Claims 1 through 3, 5 through 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 25 through 33, 35, 37, 43 through 48, 50, 51, 53, 55 through 57, and 59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by International Paper Company (Great Britain Patent No. GB 382,813). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claims 1 and 28 are not anticipated by International Paper Company under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) because International Paper Company does not describe each and every element of independent claims 1 and 28, as currently amended. In particular, International Paper Company does not describe “[an] engagement feature, **protruding from [a] movable structure**, sized and configured to cooperatively engage [an] associated wall structure … [when] disposed in a first position and to **disengage** from the associated wall structure … [when] disposed in a second position,” wherein “[the] movable structure [is] movable relative to the base,” as recited in each of independent claims 1 and 28.

International Paper Company describes a dish-shaped sheet metal protector for fibre tubes, such as the cores of paper reels, with tongues having their free ends extending outward and projecting beyond the periphery of the cylindrical portion. *International Paper Company*, Page 1, Lines 33-47. Being of resilient material, the tongues are yieldable to permit insertion of the protector in the core. *Id.*, Page 2, Lines 17-20. When the protector is removed, the tongues dig into the core material, which is sufficiently soft and yielding to permit its being gouged out, and ordinarily take out a small portion of the core with them. *Id.*, Page 2, Lines 20-31. FIGS. 1 and 2 illustrate the tongues 9 attached to the protector and International Paper Company describes the tongues as integral to the protector. *Id.*, Page 1, line 44. However, International Paper Company does not describe the tongues as protruding from a movable structure that is movable relative to the lid and that facilitates movement between a first and second position to engage and disengage from the tube core. International Paper Company describes the tongues as being yieldable **by the fibre tube** on insertion, and not as a **movable structure** that is movable relative to the base. *Id.*, Page 2, Lines 20-47. Also, the tongues are not movable by a movable structure, from which they protrude, to a second position to **disengage** them from the tube wall, but instead the tongues **dig in** and **gouge out** the core material when the protector is forcibly extracted from the tube. *Id.*

As International Paper Company does not describe “[an] engagement feature, **protruding from [a] movable structure**, sized and configured to cooperatively engage [an] associated wall structure … [when] disposed in a first position and to **disengage** from the associated wall structure … [when] disposed in a second position,” wherein “[the] movable structure [is]

movable relative to the base,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 28, as currently amended, Applicant asserts that claims 1 and 28 are not anticipated by International Paper Company and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Applicant additionally asserts that each of dependent claims 2, 3, 5 through 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, and 25 through 27 is allowable at least because each depends from claim 1, which is allowable, and that each of dependent claims 29 through 33, 35, 37, 43 through 48, 50, 51, 53, 55 through 57, and 59 is allowable at least because each depends from claim 28, which is allowable. Therefore, Applicant asserts that claims 2, 3, 5 through 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 25 through 27, 29 through 33, 35, 37, 43 through 48, 50, 51, 53, 55 through 57, and 59 are not anticipated by International Paper Company and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Regarding dependent claims 26, 44, and 57, Applicant additionally asserts that International Paper Company does not describe “[a] closure element [that] is sized and configured to fit entirely within the bore of the tubular member,” as recited in each of dependent claims 26, 44, and 57. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 26, 44, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for this additional reason.

Regarding dependent claims 33 and 50, Applicant additionally asserts that International Paper Company does not describe “an aperture formed in the wall of the tubular member,” as recited in dependent claims 33 and 50. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 33 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for this additional reason.

Anticipation Rejection Based on German Patent No. DE 82 03 991.7 to Müller

Claims 1 through 11, 24 through 26, 28 through 37, 43, 44, and 59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Müller (German Patent No. DE 82 03 991.7). An English translation of Müller (referred hereinafter as “the Müller translation”) having marked page and paragraph numbers is enclosed herewith to facilitate specific references to Müller. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claims 1 and 28 are not anticipated by Müller under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) because Müller does not describe each and every element of independent claims 1 and 28, as currently amended. In particular, Müller does not describe “[an] attachment member structurally coupling … [an] engagement feature and [a] movable structure to the base, configured to facilitate movement of the … movable structure and the … engagement feature **without substantially deforming** the base,” or “[an] engagement feature, **protruding** from [a] movable structure, … [the] movable structure [is] **movable relative to the base**,” as recited in each of independent claims 1 and 28.

Müller describes a packaging tube having a tubelike body 1 and a removable lid 2. The removable lid 2 has a lid bottom 4 and two lugs 6 configured on an outer surface of a margin 5 of the lid 2. *The Müller translation*, Page 3, Paragraph 12. As shown in FIG. 1, the removable lid 2 also has a bridgelike element 9 formed on the lid 2 at an end 5' of the margin 5 in the region of one lug 6, which forms a gripping surface that one can grasp from underneath, facilitating a removal of the lid 3 from the tubular body 1. *Id.*, Page 3, Paragraph 12. The bridgelike element 9 is not illustrated or described as being **movable relative to the lid bottom 4**, the lid end 5', the lid margin 5, or the annular flange 7. *Id.*, Page 3, Paragraph 12.

As described in the Müller Translation, “when the lid is placed on and when the lid is taken off the material of the packaging tube (e.g., paper or cardboard) moves out of the way of a lug and/or if the lid is made of elastic plastic the lug is moved to the side....” *Id.*, Page 2, Paragraph 6. Müller does not describe the lug 6 as **protruding** from a movable structure, nor does Müller describe an attachment feature that facilitates movement of the lug 6 **without substantially deforming** the lid 2. On the contrary, Müller describes the lug as moving if the lid is made of elastic plastic; this would allow the lug to move because the lid would be easily deformed. *Id.*

As Müller does not describe each and every element and limitation recited in independent claims 1 and 28, as currently amended, Applicant asserts that claims 1 and 28 are not anticipated by Müller and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Applicant additionally asserts that each of dependent claims 2 through 11 and 24 through 26 is allowable at least because each depends from claim 1, which is allowable, and each of dependent claims 29 through 37, 43, 44, and 59 is allowable at least because each depends from claim 28, which is allowable. Therefore, Applicant asserts that claims 2 through 11, 24 through 26, 29 through 37, 43, 44, and 59 are not anticipated by Müller and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Regarding dependent claims 26, 44, and 57, Applicant additionally asserts that Müller does not describe “[a] closure element [that] is sized and configured to fit **entirely** within the bore of the tubular member,” as recited in dependent claims 26, 44, and 57. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 26, 44, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for this additional reason.

Regarding dependent claims 27 and 45, Applicant additionally asserts that Müller does not describe a closure element “wherein … [the] engagement feature is resiliently **cantilevered** from the base,” as recited in dependent claims 27 and 45. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 27 and 45 U.S.C. § 102(b) for this additional reason.

Anticipation Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,435,455 to Prüss

Claims 1 through 6, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Prüss (U.S. Patent No. 5,435,455). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Prüss under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) because Prüss does not describe each and every element of independent claim 1, as currently amended. In particular, Prüss does not describe “[an] engagement feature, **protruding from [a] movable structure**,” wherein “[the] movable structure [is] **movable relative to the base**,” and “configured to facilitate movement of the … engagement feature between the first position and the second position,” as recited in independent claim 1.

With reference to FIGS. 1 and 2, Prüss describes a plug 1 for insertion into a housing 3, such as a valve box for a fluid control system. *Prüss*, column 1, line 68 – column 2, line 2. The plug 1 has the shape of a hollow cylinder having a closed end 1.1 and a cylindrical outer wall 1.2. *Id.*, column 1, lines 65-68. The plug 1 also has a catch member 5 that projects outwardly from the cylindrical outer wall 1.2 and is capable of being bent resiliently toward the cylindrical outer wall 1.2. *Id.*, Column 2, Lines 4-7. The plug 1 is resiliently bent when the plug 1 is pushed into the bore 2, and when the catch member 5 passes the edge of the abutment surface 9, the catch member 5 will spring outwardly and lodge in the passage 4. *Id.*, Column 2, Lines 31-41. The plug 1 can be removed by inserting a mandrel or rod-like tool into passage 4 to push the catch member 5 so that it is released from its locked position in the bore 2. *Id.*, Column 2, Lines 48-54. Prüss does not describe the catch member 5 as **protruding from a movable structure**, movable relative to the plug 1, that facilitates movement between a first and second position. On the contrary, Prüss describes the catch member 5 as being resiliently bent as it is pushed into the bore 2 by a **mandrel or rod-like tool, which may be inserted** into passage 4 to push the catch member 5 to release it from its locked position. *Id.*, Column 2, Lines 31-54.

As Prüss does not describe “[an] engagement feature, **protruding from [a] movable structure**,” wherein “[the] movable structure [is] **movable relative to the base**,” and “configured to facilitate movement of the … engagement feature between the first position and the second position,” as recited in independent claim 1, as currently amended, Applicant asserts that claim 1 is not anticipated by Prüss and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Applicant additionally asserts that each of dependent claims 2 through 6 and 27 is allowable at least because each depends from claim 1, which is allowable. Therefore, Applicant

asserts that claims 2 through 6 and 27 are not anticipated by Prüss and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections**

Obviousness Rejection Based on Great Britain Patent No. GB 382,813 to International Paper Company

Claims 8, 34, and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over International Paper Company (Great Britain Patent No. GB 382,813). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

M.P.E.P. 706.02(j) sets forth the standard for a Section 103(a) rejection:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (Emphasis added).

Claim 8 depends indirectly from independent claim 1, and claims 34 and 52 depend indirectly from independent claim 28. Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 8, 34, and 52 could not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the inventions were made because International Paper Company does not teach or suggest “[an] engagement feature, protruding from [a] movable structure, sized and configured to cooperatively engage [an] associated wall structure … [when] disposed in a first position and to disengage from the associated wall structure … [when] disposed in a second position,” wherein “[the] movable structure [is] movable relative to the base,” as recited in each of independent claims 1 and 28.

International Paper Company teaches a dish-shaped sheet metal protector for fibre tubes, such as the cores of paper reels, with tongues having their free ends extending outward and projecting beyond the periphery of the cylindrical portion. *International Paper Company*, Page 1, Lines 33-47. Being of resilient material, the tongues are yieldable to permit insertion of the protector in the core. *Id.*, Page 2, Lines 17-20. When the protector is removed, the tongues

dig into the core material, which is sufficiently soft and yielding to permit its being gouged out, and ordinarily take out a small portion of the core with them. *Id.*, Page 2, Lines 20-31. FIGS. 1 and 2 illustrate the tongues 9 attached to the protector, and International Paper Company teaches the tongues as being integral to the protector. *Id.*, Page 1, line 44. However, International Paper Company does not teach or suggest the tongues as protruding from a movable structure that is movable relative to the lid and that facilitates movement between a first and second position to engage and disengage from the tube core. International Paper Company teaches the tongues as being yieldable **by the fibre tube** on insertion, and not as a **movable structure** that is movable relative to the base. *Id.*, Page 2, Lines 20-47. Also, the tongues are not movable by a movable structure, from which they protrude, to a second position to **disengage** them from the tube wall, but instead the tongues **dig in** and **gouge out** the core material when the protector is forcibly extracted from the tube. *Id.*

As International Paper Company does not teach or suggest “[an] engagement feature, **protruding from [a] movable structure**, sized and configured to cooperatively engage [an] associated wall structure … [when] disposed in a first position and to **disengage** from the associated wall structure … [when] disposed in a second position,” wherein “[the] movable structure [is] movable relative to the base,” as recited in each of independent claims 1 and 28, as currently amended. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 8, 34, and 52 could not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the inventions were made and requests that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) obviousness rejection to dependent claims 8, 34, and 52.

#### Obviousness Rejection Based on German Patent No. DE 82 03 991.7 to Müller

Claims 46 through 48 and 50 through 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Müller (German Patent No. DE 82 03 991.7). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Each of claims 46 through 48 and 50 through 57 depends from independent claim 28 and includes the elements and limitations recited therein. Applicant respectfully asserts that the inventions of claims 46 through 48 and 50 through 57 could not have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the inventions were made because Müller does not teach or suggest “[an] attachment member structurally coupling … [an] engagement feature and [a] movable structure to the base, configured to facilitate movement of the … movable structure and the … engagement feature **without substantially deforming** the base,” or “[an] engagement feature, **protruding** from [a] movable structure,” wherein “[the] movable structure [is] **movable relative to the base**,” as recited in each of independent claims 1 and 28.

Müller teaches a packaging tube having a tubelike body 1 and a removable lid 2. The removable lid 2 has a lid bottom 4 and two lugs 6 configured on an outer surface of a margin 5 of the lid 2. *The Müller translation*, Page 3, Paragraph 12. As shown in FIG. 1, the removable lid 2 also has a bridgelike element 9 formed on the lid 2 at an end 5' of the margin 5 in the region of one lug 6, which forms a gripping surface that one can grasp from underneath, facilitating a removal of the lid 3 from the tubular body 1. *Id.*, Page 3, Paragraph 12. The bridgelike element 9 is not illustrated or taught as being **movable relative to the lid bottom 4**, the lid end 5', the lid margin 5, or the annular flange 7. *Id.*, Page 3, Paragraph 12.

As taught in the Müller Translation, “when the lid is placed on and when the lid is taken off the material of the packaging tube (e.g., paper or cardboard) moves out of the way of a lug and/or if the lid is made of elastic plastic the lug is moved to the side...” *Id.*, Page 2, Paragraph 6. Müller does not teach or suggest the lug 6 as **protruding** from a movable structure, nor does Müller teach or suggest an attachment feature that facilitates movement of the lug 6 **without substantially deforming** the lid 2. On the contrary, Müller teaches the lug as moving if the lid is made of elastic plastic; this would allow the lug to move because the lid would be easily deformed. *Id.*

As Müller does not teach or suggest “[an] attachment member structurally coupling … [an] engagement feature and [a] movable structure to the base, configured to facilitate movement of the … movable structure and the … engagement feature **without substantially deforming** the base,” or “[an] engagement feature, **protruding** from [a] movable structure,” wherein “[the] movable structure [is] **movable relative to the base**,” as recited in independent claim 28 as currently amended, Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent claims 46 through 48 and 50 through 57 could not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

inventions were made. Therefore, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) obviousness rejection to dependent claims 46 through 48 and 50 through 57.

### ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS

The amendments to claims 1, 4, 9 through 11, 13, 14, 27, 28, 31, 35 through 37, 45, 46, 48, and 53 through 55 above should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application.

### CONCLUSION

Claims 1 through 59 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



J. Jeffrey Gunn

Registration No. 56,957

Attorney for Applicant

TRASKBRITT

P.O. Box 2550

Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550

Telephone: 801-532-1922

Enclosure: English Translation of Müller (German Patent No. DE 82 03 991.7) Having  
Numbered Pages and Paragraphs

Date: May 26, 2006

JJG/sfc:slm

Document in ProLaw

Federal Republic of Germany

German Patent Office



Utility Model U1

Roll Number G 82 03 991.7

(51) Main class B65d 51/14

Secondary class(es) B65d 75/00

(22) Application date: 13 Feb 82

(47) Registration date: 19 May 82

(43) Publication in Patent Journal: 1 July 82

(54) Title of object:

Packaging tube

(71) Name and address of proprietor:

Müller, Erich, 8404 Wörth, De

## Packaging tube

[1] The invention pertains to a packaging tube with at least one removable lid at one end of the tube, which has a bottom as well as a margin surrounding this bottom.

[2] Packaging tubes of this kind are familiar and are used, for example, to keep and/or send documents, drawings, large-format photos, etc.

[3] In order to hold and secure the removable lid, the known packaging tubes employ metal tongues, which are fastened to the particular tube and bent onto the particular lid after it is closed. Such metal tongues can very easily result in damage. Moreover, the use of metal tongues as a securing element is not particularly advantageous from the standpoint of the most rational possible production.

[4] The invention is based on the problem of designing a packaging tube which avoids these drawbacks.

[5] To solve this problem, a packaging tube of the kind described at the outset is newly configured so that at least one projecting lug is provided at the margin of the lid, and the tube has an opening at its end that accommodates the lug.

[6] When the lid is placed on, the lug snaps into the opening provided for it in the tube and thereby secures the lid against unwanted loosening from the packaging tube. By overcoming a certain force, the lid can then be removed once again from the packaging tube at any time, wherein both when the lid is placed on and when the lid is taken off the material of the packaging tube (e.g., paper or cardboard) moves out of the way of the lug and/or if the lid is made of elastic plastic the lug is moved to the side when the lid is put on or taken off.

[7] In one advisable embodiment of the invented packaging tube, at least two lugs are provided on the lid, and of course each lug is assigned its own opening in the tube.

[8] Further modifications of the invention are the subject of the subsidiary claims.

[9] The invention shall now be explained more closely by means of the figures and a sample embodiment. These show:

[10] Figure 1, in side view and in schematic representation, a packaging tube according to the invention;  
Figure 2, in magnified partial representation and in cross section, one end of the packaging tube with the lid set in place;  
Figure 3, a top view of a lid;  
Figure 4, in partial representation, a side view of the lid per Fig. 3.

[11] The packaging tube shown in the figures, which is especially suitable for the keeping or the sending of documents, drawings, large-format photos, etc., consists of a tubelike body 1, which for example is multilayered and made by rolling up paper or cardboard, as well as a first lid 2 and a second lid 3. Both lids in the sample embodiment shown are made from a single piece of plastic and have a bowl-like shape, which is formed by the bottom of the lid 4 and the cylindrical margin 5 adjoining this bottom.

[12] The left end of the tubelike body 1 shown in Fig. 1 is firmly closed by the lid 2, i.e., the lid 2 inserted there is secured by suitable means, such as staples, to the tubelike body 1. The lid 3 is removable and has two lugs 6 configured on the outer surface of its margin 5, being spaced from each other by 180 degrees. The two lugs 6 each lie closer to the lid bottom 4 than to the upper (in Fig. 2) end 5' of the margin 5 away from the lid bottom 4. In the sample embodiment shown, the lugs 6 lie directly above the lid bottom 4. At the end 5' the lid 3 furthermore has a sideways projecting annular flange 7, which when the lid 3 is put in place comes to lie against the corresponding end of the tubelike body 1 and thereby prevents the lid 3 from being inserted too deeply into the tubelike body 1.

Furthermore, the lid 3 has at its end 5' at least one groove 8 above one of the lugs 6, serving as a line-up marker and also extending beyond the end of the flange 7 away from the lid bottom 4. Finally, in the region of one lug 6, a bridgelike element 9 is formed on the lid 3 at the end 5', forming a gripping surface that one can grasp from underneath, facilitating a removal of the lid 3 from the tubular body 1. This bridgelike element 9, which with its surface sides lies roughly parallel to the surface sides of the lid bottom 4, reaches into the space enclosed by the margin 5 of the lid and forms a grasping edge 9' there. Outside of the grasping edge 9', the bridgelike element 9 passes gradually into the margin 5. In the sample embodiment shown, the grasping edge 9' is vaulted or curved in shape, and the radius of curvature of this grasping edge is larger than the radius of the lid 3 and the center of curvature of the grasping edge 9' is displaced relative to the center of the lid 3.

[13] The two lugs 6 have at their lower end in Fig. 2 a bevel 6'. For each lug 6, this bevel, the same as the free end projecting beyond the outer surface of the margin 5, is convexly curved in cross sectional planes that lie parallel with the surface sides of the lid bottom.

[14] Each lug 6 is matched up with a recess or opening 10 in the tubelike body 1, and one lug engages in each opening 10 when the lid 3 is put in place, thereby holding the lid on. The openings 10 are circular round or rectangular in shape and have a distance from the open end of the tubelike body 1 that is roughly the same or slightly less than the distance of the lugs 6 from the underside of the flange 7.

[15] On the circumferential surface of the margin 5 there are provided several ribs 11, preferably acting like barbs, which lie against the inner surface of the tubelike body 1 when the lid 3 is put in place and thereby ensure a good seating and tight closure. At least one such rib 11 is also provided underneath the lugs 6, i.e., between the lugs 6 and the lower side of the lid bottom away from these lugs, so that after the lid 3 is put in place the interior of the tubelike body 1 is also closed off from the openings 10 and thus neither

dust, nor water, etc., can get through these openings into the interior of the packaging tube.

[16] If an especially tight seal is desired, the openings 10 in the outer surface of the tubelike body 1 can be closed by a cover 12. This cover 12 is formed, for example, from a strip of paper or cardboard; the cover 12 can also be formed by a layer, for example, of paper or cardboard, which is applied to the entire outer surface of the tubelike body after the openings are made.

[17] The invention has been described above by one sample embodiment. Of course, changes and modifications are possible, without thereby leaving behind the essential notion of the invention.

## Claims

1. Packaging tube with at least one removable lid at one end of the tube, which has a bottom as well as a margin surrounding this bottom, characterized in that at least one projecting lug is provided at the margin (5) of the lid (3), and the tube (1) has at least one opening (10) at its end that accommodates the lug (6).
2. Packaging tube per claim 1, characterized in that the lug (6) has a bevel (6') at its end lying closer to the bottom (4) of the lid (3).
3. Packaging tube per claim 1 or 2, characterized in that the lug (6) is convexly curved at its end projecting beyond the margin (5) of the lid.
4. Packaging tube per one of claims 1 to 3, characterized in that the lug (6) lies closer to the bottom (4) of the lid (3) than to the end (5') of the margin (5) lying away from the bottom (4).
5. Packaging tube per one of claims 1 to 4, characterized in that at least one projecting annular rib (11) is formed between the lug (6) and the bottom (4) or the underside of this bottom on the outer surface of the margin (5) of the lid (3).
6. Packaging tube per one of claims 1 to 5, characterized in that the opening (10) in the outer surface of the tube (1) is closed.
7. Packaging tube per one of claims 1 to 6, characterized in that the lid (3) has an inwardly projecting bridgelike element (9) at its end away from the bottom (4), forming a grasping edge (9) that can be grabbed from underneath.
8. Packaging tube per claim 7, characterized in that the bridgelike element (9) is provided in the region of the lug (6).
9. Packaging tube per one of claims 1 to 8, characterized in that the lid (3) has a sighting mark, preferably in the form of a groove (8), at its end away from the bottom (4).
10. Packaging tube per claim 9, characterized in that the sighting mark (8) is provided above the lug (6).
11. Packaging tube per one of claims 1 to 10, characterized in that at least two lugs (6) are provided on the lid.
12. Packaging tube per one of claims 1 to 11, characterized in that the lid (3) including its elements is fabricated as a single piece from plastic.